

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JOEL STEDMAN and KAREN JOYCE, on  
behalf of themselves all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE CO.,

Defendant.

Case No. C18-1254RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO SEAL

This matter comes before the Court on “Plaintiffs’ Motion to File Under Seal.” Dkt. # 66. Plaintiffs seek to seal excerpts of testimony and an exhibit on the ground that defense counsel designated the documents as confidential during discovery.

“There is a strong presumption of public access to the court’s files,” and, absent a showing that the public’s right of access is outweighed by the interests of the public and/or the parties in shielding the material from public view, a seal is not appropriate. LCR 5(g). A party’s unilateral designation of a document as confidential under a protective order does not, in and of itself, justify a seal under LCR 5(g)(2). Defendant did not file a response to the motion as required by LCR 5(g)(3) or otherwise show the legitimate private or public interests that warrant a seal, the injury that would result from public disclosure, or that the public’s right of access should give way.

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
TO SEAL - 1

1 Because the parties have not made the showing necessary to preclude public access to the  
2 documents at issue, plaintiffs' request for a seal is DENIED. The Clerk of Court is directed to  
3 unseal Dkt. # 67.

4  
5 Dated this 28th day of January, 2022.

6 

7 Robert S. Lasnik  
8 United States District Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
TO SEAL - 2